UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,719	10/17/2003	Jong-Phil Lee	44663	8798

7590 05/11/2011

Peter L. Kendall
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
LAI, MICHAEL C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2457	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/11/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,719	LEE, JONG-PHIL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL C. LAI	2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01/05/2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on 1/5/2011.

   Claims 1-17 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments presented in the pre-appeal brief request for review dated 1/5/2011 (claimed subject matter rejected under official notice), is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of office action dated 11/05/2010, is **withdrawn and the prosecution is hereby reopened**. However, upon further consideration of the available prior arts, the claimed subject matter is rejected with the new grounds of rejection. This office action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1, 3-5, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

   Claim 1 recites the limitation "the web browser" in line 7. It is unclear whether it refers to "a web browser" in line 4, or "a web browser of a telecommunication system" in lines 4-5. Other limitations reciting "the web browser" are also rejected for the same reason.

   Claim 1 recites the limitation "a CGI and/or ASP program of the server driven by the embedded web server" in lines 10-11. It is unclear whether "the server"

and “the embedded web server” are the same or not. If not, it is unclear what server it is referring to.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "…generate a command enabling communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system, and displaying data of the selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command…” in lines 10-13. It is unclear whether the command is actually executed or not. If not, how the displaying according to the command is actually being carried out. Note that according to Microsoft Computer dictionary, Fifth Edition, a command is “An instruction to a computer program that, when issued by the user, causes an action to be carried out. Commands are usually either typed at the keyboard or chosen from a menu”. Since the specification does not describe what specifically a command is, **a command must be issued or executed,** not just generated, in order to carry out an action according to Microsoft Computer dictionary.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "…generate a command enabling communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system, and updating the same data updated in the mobile phone according to the command…” in lines 16-18. It is unclear whether the command is actually executed or not. If not, how the updating according to the command is actually being carried out. See discussion above.

Claims 4, 5, and 9-11 are rejected for similar reasons as for claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6,519,241B1, hereinafter Theimer), in view of Zweig (US 2002/0173877 A1, hereinafter Zweig), and further in view of Hauduc et al. (US 6,993,568 B1, hereinafter Hauduc).

Regarding claim 1, Theimer discloses a device for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the device comprising:

an embedded web server for displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through a web browser of a telecommunication system [FIG. 1 Web server 2, Authorized browser 5, and column 3, lines 26-48], displaying data of a selected menu stored in the mobile telephone on the web browser according to the command [col. 3, lines 49-64, display on authorized browser 5];

a CGI and/or ASP program of the server driven by the embedded web server [col. 4, lines 16-26]; and

a memory for storing data of the information management menus [col. 4, lines 8-13, storage medium 12].

Theimer discloses substantially the claimed invention as described above, but fail to specifically disclose about: driving a CGI and/or ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser; a homepage of the mobile telephone, for displaying information management menus of the mobile telephone and including a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language. However Zweig discloses a mobile robotic having an embedded web server and a CGI program that can generate a command for communication between the mobile robotic and a remote system over the internet using a web browser. Zweig also discloses a web page of the mobile robotic for displaying information management menus of the mobile robotic [see at least the abstract, para. 0016, 0034, 0061, and 0076]. Zweig further discloses communications between the mobile robotic and the remote system regarding modification/updates over the internet using a web browser [see at least para. 0038].

Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer by incorporating Zweig's idea in order to achieve remote control/updates on a mobile robotic/phone using a remote browser on the internet as claimed [see at least the abstract].

Theimer and Zweig disclose substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically disclose a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language.

However, Hauduc discloses the idea of using language packs that can convert the content of the Web pages into the desired language and render the translated content for the Web client [col. 2, lines 35-49]. Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer and Zweig by incorporating Hauduc's idea for the purpose of providing the content of a Web application in the client's preferred language, thereby providing language localization for server-based applications.

Regarding claim 2, Theimer further discloses wherein said information management menus represent information of the mobile telephone [col. 1, lines 34-44].

Regarding claim 3, Theimer discloses a method for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing the mobile telephone through an Internet web browser of a telecommunication system [FIG. 1, Authorized browser 5, and column 3, lines 26-48];

displaying a page of the mobile telephone on the web browser [col. 1, lines 34-44];

displaying information management menus [col. 3, lines 49-64, display on authorized browser 5].

Theimer discloses substantially the claimed invention as described above, but fail to specifically disclose about: driving, by an embedded web server of the mobile phone, a CGI and/or ASP program to generate a command enabling communication between the mobile phone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message of successful update to the web browser; displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on the web browser including a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language. However Zweig discloses a mobile robotic having an embedded web server and a CGI program that can generate a command for communication between the mobile robotic and a remote system over the internet using a web browser. Zweig also discloses a web page of the mobile robotic for displaying information management menus of the mobile robotic [see at least the abstract, para. 0016, 0034, 0061, and 0076]. Zweig further discloses communications between the mobile robotic and the remote system regarding modification/updates over the internet using a web browser [see at least para. 0038].

Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer by incorporating Zweig's idea in order to achieve remote control/updates on a

mobile robotic/phone using a remote browser on the internet as claimed [see at least the abstract].

Theimer and Zweig disclose substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically disclose a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language.

However, Hauduc discloses the idea of using language packs that can convert the content of the Web pages into the desired language and render the translated content for the Web client [col. 2, lines 35-49]. Thus it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Theimer and Zweig by incorporating Hauduc's idea for the purpose of providing the content of a Web application in the client's preferred language, thereby providing language localization for server-based applications.

Claims 4-5 substantially incorporate all the limitations of claims 1-3. The reasons for the rejection of claims 1-3 apply to claims 4-5. Therefore claims 4-5 are rejected for substantially the same reasons.

Regarding claims 6-7, Theimer further discloses wherein said command includes a standard protocol for communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser [col. 4, lines 16-25].

Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 2. It is rejected for the same reason as for claim 2.

Claims 9-14 are of the same scope as claims 3-8. They are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 3-8.

7. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (US 6,519,241B1, hereinafter Theimer), in view of Zweig (US 2002/0173877 A1, hereinafter Zweig) and Hauduc et al. (US 6,993,568 B1, hereinafter Hauduc), and further in view of Parry (US 7,002,703 B2, hereinafter Parry).

Regarding claim 15, Theimer, Zweig, and Hauduc disclose the claimed invention except for specifically disclose that displaying the homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser of a telecommunication system further comprises receiving a website address of the mobile telephone in the web browser to access the mobile telephone. However, displaying the homepage of a device by entering the URL or the website address of the device is well known in the art, as evidenced by Parry [see col. 11, lines 22-34]. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Parry's teaching into Theimer's, Zweig's, and Hauduc's system since entering the URL or the website address of the mobile telephone on a web browser of a telecommunication system is the most direct way of accessing the homepage of the mobile telephone.

Claims 16-17 are of the same scope as claim 15. They are rejected for the same reasons as for claim 15.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL C. LAI whose telephone number is (571)270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
07MAY2011

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457